

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00018 061320Z

53

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 053127

P 061230Z FEB 75

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2403

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY

USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 0018

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: AMBASSADOR JOHNSONS STATEMENT OF FEBRUARY 6, 1975  
(SALT TWO-507)

THE FOLLOWING IS STATEMENT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR  
JOHNSON AT THE SALT TWO MEETING OF FEBRUARY 6, 1975.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR JOHNSON  
FEBRUARY 6, 1975

MR MINISTER:

I

AT OUR FIRST MEETING LAST WEEK I NOTED SOME OF THE TASKS  
WHICH I BELIEVE WE MUST ACCOMPLISH IN PREPARING OUR NEW  
AGREEMENT--TASKS WHICH ARE IN MANY RESPECTS DISTINGUISHED BY  
THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THIS AND THE EARLIER INTERIM AGREEMENT  
LIMITING STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS.

AT OUR MOST RECENT MEETING I DISCUSSED THE PROBLEM OF  
VERIFICATION AND LISTED SOME OF THE IMPORTANT MATTERS RELATING  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00018 061320Z

TO THIS ISSUE THAT I BELIEVE WE MUST RESOLVE TOGETHER DURING

OUR DISCUSSIONS HERE. TODAY I WANT TO CONTINUE MY DISCUSSION OF THE TASKS WHICH COME BEFORE US, IN THE BELIEF THAT A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUES AND PROBLEMS BEFORE US IS A NECESSARY FIRST STEP IN REACHING MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE SOLUTIONS TO THESE MATTERS.

AS WE BOTH NOTED AT OUR MEETING ON FEBRUARY 4, THE NEW AGREEMENT ON WHICH WE ARE WORKING WILL DIFFER FROM THE INTERIM AGREEMENT IN A NUMBER OF RESPECTS. ONE OF THESE DIFFERENCES STEMS FROM THE BROADER SCOPE OF THE NEW AGREEMENT WHICH WILL PLACE LIMITS ON STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS HAVING DIFFERENT CHARACTERISTICS. THEREFORE, THERE IS A NEED FOR ADDITIONAL AND MORE PRECISE DEFINITIONS OF THE SYSTEMS TO BE LIMITED, AND I PROPOSE TO DISCUSS THE SUBJECT OF DEFINITIONS WITH YOU AT A SUBSEQUENT MEETING.

HOWEVER, IT IS NOT ENOUGH TO HAVE CLEAR AND SPECIFIC DEFINITIONS OF THE ARMS TO BE LIMITED IN THE NEW AGREEMENT. WE ALSO NEED TO HAVE MUTUAL AGREEMENT AS TO WHEN IN THE COURSE OF THEIR CONSTRUCTION, DEPLOYMENT, AND DEACTIVATION CYCLES THESE ARMS ARE TO BE INCLUDED IN AND ELIMINATED FROM THE AGGREGATE NUMBERS SET BY THE AGREEMENT. MOREOVER, MR MINISTER, I BELIEVE THAT IT IS EQUALLY IMPORTANT TO HAVE MUTUALLY AGREED CRITERIA AS TO HOW THE RELEVANT STAGES IN THESE CONSTRUCTION, DEPLOYMENT, AND DEACTIVATION CYCLES SHALL BE DETERMINED.

## II

WE BEGIN WITH THE AGGREGATE NUMBERS OF THE VLADIVOSTOK ACCORD, THE VARIOUS SYSTEMS WHICH ARE TO BE INCLUDED IN THOSE AGGREGATE NUMBERS, AND THE FACT THAT THE NEW AGREEMENT IS TO EXTEND UNTIL 1985. FROM THESE CONSIDERATIONS, I THINK IT IS CLEAR THAT OVER THE NEXT TEN YEARS THERE IS GOING TO BE A CHANGING MAKE UP IN THE STRATEGIC FORCES OF EACH SIDE WHICH ARE TO BE COVERED IN THE NEW AGREEMENT. MORE SPECIFICALLY, OVER THE COURSE OF THE NEXT TEN YEARS, BOTH SIDES WILL, AMONG OTHER THINGS, DEVELOP, TEST, CONSTRUCT, DEPLOY, TRAIN WITH, MODIFY, CONVERT, MODERNIZE, REPLACE, PLACE IN RESERVE, DISMANTLE, AND DESTROY VARIOUS STRATEGIC ARMS WHICH WILL BE LIMITED BY THE NEW AGREEMENT. IT APPEARS, THEREFORE, MOST IMPORTANT THAT FROM THE OUTSET THERE BE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES AS TO THE STAGES AT WHICH VARIOUS WEAPONS SHOULD BE INCLUDED, EXCLUDED, OR REMOVED FROM THE AGGREGATE NUMBERS.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 00018 061320Z

ACCORDINGLY, IN THE SAME VEIN IN WHICH I DISCUSSED THE PROBLEMS OF VERIFICATION WITH YOU EARLIER THIS WEEK, I WANT TO SUGGEST SOME OF THE QUESTIONS WHICH ARISE IN THIS CONTEXT AND WHICH, I HOPE, CAN BE ANSWERED THROUGH THE EFFORTS OF OUR DELEGATIONS WORKING TOGETHER.

FOR EXAMPLE, AT WHAT POINT IN THE COURSE OF THEIR CONSTRUCTION, CONVERSION, OR DEPLOYMENT SHOULD STRATEGIC ARMS BE INCLUDED IN THE AGGREGATE NUMBERS? SHOULD THERE BE DIFFERENT CRITERIA

FOR, FOR EXAMPLE, ICBM LAUNCHERS AND SLBM LAUNCHERS? OR FOR MISSILE LAUNCHERS AND HEAVY BOMBERS? AND, IF SO, WHAT SHOULD THESE CRITERIA BE?

AFTER WE FIND ANSWERS TO THE FIRST QUESTION-- THAT IS, AT WHAT STAGE SHOULD A WEAPON BE INCLUDED IN THE AGGREGATE NUMBERS-- OTHER QUESTIONS ARISE. WHAT IS ITS STATUS IF IT IS MODIFIED OR CONVERTED TO A PURPOSE OTHER THAN ITS ORIGINALLY INTENDED USE? AND WHAT SHOULD BE THE CRITERIA FOR JUDGING ITS ALTERED STATUS? WHAT SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS SHOULD BE GIVEN TO , FOR INSTANCE, LAUNCHERS USED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TESTING AND TRAINING, AND SPACE ACTIVITIES? FINALLY, AS I SUGGESTED EARLIER, WEAPONS WILL BE LEAVING INVENTORIES AS WELL AS ENTERING THEM. WHAT CRITERIA SHOULD BE SET IN ORDER TO HAVE A COMMON UNDERSTANDING THAT WEAPON SHOULD NO LONGER BE INCLUDED IN THE AGGREGATE NUMBERS? SHOULD THERE BE DIFFERENT STANDARDS FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF WEAPONS?

### III

MR MINISTER, BY SETTING FORTH THESE QUESTIONS, IT IS NOT MY INTENTION TO SUGGEST THAT WE ARE DEALING WITH IMPOSSIBLY COMPLEX OR INSOLUBLE PROBLEMS. RATHER, I AM CONFIDENT THAT, BY WORKING TOGETHER, OUR DELEGATIONS CAN DEFINE THE QUESTIONS AND THEN FIND MUTUALLY SATISFACTORY ANSWERS. HERE, AGAIN, IT APPEARS THAT THIS IS AN AREA IN WHICH AD HOC WORKING GROUPS CAN, AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME, CONTRIBUTE GREATLY TO OUR TASK. WE ARE ALSO CONFIDENT THAT THE SOVIET SIDE SHARES OUR DESIRE FOR A CLEARLY DRAWN AGREEMENT WHICH WILL MINIMIZE THE POSSIBILITY OF ANY MISUNDERSTANDINGS ON THE PART OF EITHER SIDE OR AMBIGUITIES AS TO THE OBLIGATIONS BEING ASSUMED. WE LOOK FORWARD TO HEARING YOUR FURTHER THOUGHTS AND THOSE OF YOUR DELEGATION ON THESE MATTERS AND TO WORKING WITH YOU TO ARRIVE AT MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE SOLUTIONS. JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** SALT (ARMS CONTROL), MEETING DELEGATIONS, SPEECHES  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 06 FEB 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975SALTT00018  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** X1  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750043-1056  
**From:** SALT TALKS  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750266/aaaachkh.tel  
**Line Count:** 146  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION SS  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 16 JUN 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <16 JUN 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <17 JUN 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
05 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** AMBASSADOR JOHNSONS STATEMENT OF FEBRUARY 6, 1975 (SALT TWO-507)  
**TAGS:** PARM  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006